DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 106 JC 930 037

AUTHOR Boughan, Karl
TITLE Employee Perceptions of the Racial Climate at Prince George's Community College, Spring 1992.
INSTITUTION Prince George's Community Coll., Largo, MD. Office of Institutional Research and Analysis.
REPORT NO RB93-14
PUB DATE Dec 92
NOTE 35p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Employee Attitudes; Ethnic Groups; *Ethnic Relations; *Minority Groups; *Racial Attitudes; *Racial Relations; Student Attitudes; Tables (Data); Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Student Relationship; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Prince Georges Community College MD

ABSTRACT

The 1990 U.S. Census's discovery that Prince George's County in Maryland had become the nation's first basically middle-class, majority nonwhite county prompted Prince George's Community College (PGCC) to assess how well it was responding to the challenges of the new multiculturalism. In spring 1992, a racial climate attitude survey was developed and distributed to both students and employees, resulting in 17% (n=1,198) and 31% (n=552) response rates, respectively. The relatively low employee response rate limited the scope of the analysis and left portions of the PGCC work force underrepresented. Results of the survey included the following: (1) 94% of the respondents felt that relations were "OK" or "better than OK;" (2) faculty members were the most optimistic about campus race relations; (3) staff members seemed the most concerned, with only 38% rating race relations as "good" or better and 15% rating them "poor;" (4) faculty and staff, while both optimistic as groups, tended to disagree significantly on the extent to which the racial climate within the staff should be rated "good" or better; (5) compared to students, faculty respondents were 12% more prone to rate relations between nonwhite students/white faculty as "good" or better, and 10% more prone to perceive the white student/nonwhite faculty climate in the same favorable light; (6) nonwhite faculty came closest to unhappiness of the four job/race groups within the employee force, while white faculty came closest to satisfaction; and (7) around 20% of the nonwhite employees reported subtle interpersonal discrimination, such as being treated condescendingly, and 35% reported discrimination. Data tables and the survey instrument are included. (MAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED352106

Employee Perceptions of the Racial Climate at Prince George's Community College

Karl Boughan

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Boughan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PRINCE GEORGE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Research Brief RB93-14

December 1992

JC 930 037

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRINCE GEORGE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTIONS OF THE RACIAL CLIMATE AT PRINCE GEORGE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE - SPRING 1992

Report RB93-14
December 1992

Introduction

The 1990 U.S. Census's discovery that powerful demographic forces working throughout the last decade had transformed Prince George's County into the nation's first basically middle class but majority nonwhite county, a trend paralleled by the College student body shift to majority nonwhite, prompted PGCC to take stock as to how well it was responding to the challenges of the new multiculturalism. The main vehicle of it investigations was a massive Office of Institutional Research and Analysis attitude survey conducted in the Spring of 1992 concerning the quality of the racial climate on campus administered to both principle components of its community -- students and employees.

The first report based on this research focused on student attitudes.[1] What follows here is the companion review of the racial climate attitudes of PGCC employees.

Methodology

Administration and Sampling. A comprehensive account of the survey's questionnaire planning and design, sampling strategy and administrative process was provided in the above mentioned report on the student respondents. Therefore, it is unnecessary here to do more than cover the main methodological points of the study, except in those few instances where the treatment of the employee sample diverged significantly from that of the student sample.

The respondent universe of the PGCC 1992 Racial Climate attitude survey took in both the entire credit student body of that Spring semester, full-time and part-time (n=12,017), as well as the entire employee force -- administrators, classified staff and teaching faculty, full-time and part-time/adjunct (n=1,763): in short, the whole College community excluding only non-credit students.

On the student side, a sample of 6,931 potential respondents (more than half of all credit students) were selected randomly by a stratified scheme.[2] On the less populous employee side, the decision was made to attempt to interview the entire universe.

---

[1] Student Perceptions of the Racial Climate at Prince George's Community College -- Spring 1992: A Preliminary Report, OIRA Report RB93-1, July 1992.

[2] Spring 1992 credit students were randomly sampled as follows: nearly 5,000 from the nonwhite subset (deliberate oversample); around a 1,000 from the white subset (deliberate undersample); and 500 each from the part-time and developmental student subset. As explained more fully in RB93-1, the intent was to maximize chances for an accurately representative student respondent group by initially over-sampling from traditionally low responding student segments.

Questionnaires were mailed out in early May (inter-office in the employee case), and by the cut-off point of May 23, fully 17 percent of the potential student respondent group returned their answers (n=1,198), an excellent response rate for this kind of survey; furthermore, comparisons of respondent breakdowns by ethnicity, age, sex and full-time/part-time load were so close to all-student proportions that sample re-weighting would prove unnecessary.

The response rate for employees, however, was somewhat of a disappointment. Although technically higher than that generated by students, the 31 percent obtained (n=552) fell short of our expectations for a group with such a deep and continuing personal and professional stake in the College, and which was given written supervisory encouragement to participate plus a costless, easy method of response return in the campus inter-office mail system.

The effect of this relatively low employee response rate was to put a serious limit on the scope of our analysis. We were forced to restrict our attitude breakdowns to main employee race and work divisions only -- nonwhite faculty (n=37), white faculty (n=193), nonwhite staff (n=91), white staff (n=178).[3] We simply lacked enough respondents to maintain such important distinctions as administrators/classified staff, professional classified staff/non-professional classified staff, and full-time/adjunct faculty.[4] Too many cell sub-sample sizes became too small to generate reliable percentage estimates.

A second disappointment was the relative unrepresentativeness of the respondent sample itself. Certain sectors of the employee force failed to respond at rates proportionate to their actual numerical weight, with the result that the employee respondent group required re-weighting to bring it back into balance. Categories particularly needing adjustment for poor response rate were part-timers (-27 percent) and nonwhite employees (-10 percent).[5]

Questionnaire Design. In large part, the same questionnaire instrument was applied to both the targeted student sample and the employee group to enable us to obtain a true community-wide evaluation of the College's racial climate and a systematic comparison of student/employee views. The common battery of attitude items included direct ratings of all-college racial relations and race relations between and within various PGCC groups, as well as indirect measures of personal race attitudes, perspectives on campus racial climate, and gauges of climate emotional impact.

Both sides were also asked very similar sets of questions on respondent experience with, and response to, incidents of racial bias on campus. But due to differences in the types of bias incidents mentioned in student and employee cases these results are only very broadly comparable between response groups.

---

[3] These four category frequencies fall 53 respondents short of 552 because that many shied away from answering the sensitive but crucial ethnic background question. Thus the already small employee respondent group was further reduced to 499.

[4] For the remainder of this report the term "staff" will be used generically to refer to any non-faculty employees, whether administrators, professional or non-professional classified staffers.

[5] See Appendix for a detailed review of the unweighted employee respondent sample and the weighting procedure used to correct for sample biases.

Finally, two series of questions appeared only on the employee group questionnaire. These delved into the quality of worklife at PGCC, the first in a general way and the second -- asked of faculty respondents exclusively -- as it relates specifically to teaching and classroom experiences. The intention here was to explore more fully how PGCC's racial climate impacted on, or flowed from, the actions and attitudes of that portion of the campus community responsible for the functioning of the College.

In the remainder of this report, we will review the outstanding findings of our racial climate study. Using responses to the shared questionnaire items, the first section just below will discuss how PGCC employee general racial perceptions and attitudes compare with those of the College's student body[6]. The next section will present the results of the employee-only and faculty only questionnaire items which take up the special job and race-related concerns of these groups. Finally, in the last section we will explore the type and extent of race bias in campus workplaces by means of the specific racial incident reporting provided by our employee respondents.

Basic Findings: Students and Employees Compared

PGCC Racial Climate Ratings. The common student-employee battery of our questionnaire allowed respondents directly to rate the quality of inter-ethnic relations for the campus as a whole and between and within its various constituencies. Also, respondents were provided with the opportunity to rate the PGCC climate comparatively, with respect to that of two years ago and over and against the racial climates of other colleges and universities in the respondents' experiences. The rating indicators used were 5-point scales, ranging from Very Poor-Very Good in the inter-group case and from Much Worse-Much Better in the comparative case. For the sake of brevity and clarity, the summary table below presents the data in terms of "collapsed" 3-point scales of racial climate perception.

P.G.C.C. RATINGS:* GROUPS by 3-POINT SCALE %	PGCC** -	0	+	Students -	0	+	Faculty -	0	+	Staff -	0	+
CLIMATE HERE/NOW												
PGCC as a Whole	7	41	53	7	41	52	5	36	59	7	40	53
Within Student Body	10	45	45	10	45	45	9	44	47	15	48	38
Within Employee Force	7	39	55	6	42	52	7	17	76	9	32	58
W Faculty vs NW Students	11	39	50	11	40	49	11	28	61	18	37	45
NW Faculty vs W Students	5	39	56	5	39	56	3	31	66	8	40	52
Mean Positive	--	--	52	--	--	51	--	--	62	--	--	49
CLIMATE COMPARED												
with Two Years Ago	13	60	28	12	60	28	15	64	21	17	56	27
with Other Schools	11	42	47	11	42	47	8	40	52	16	43	41
Mean Positive	--	--	38	--	--	38	--	--	37	--	--	34

* Excluding DK/NA responses; rounded percentages may not sum to 100 %

** Key to Column headings: CLIMATE HERE/NOW=Poor/Very Poor (-), Neither (0), Good/Very Good (+); COMPARED=Worse/Much Worse (-), Same (0), Better/Much Better (+)

[6] When all-College percentages are reported here, responses will have been weighted precisely to reflect known student, faculty and staff proportions in the total PGCC community.

Respondent rating of the racial climate of the College as a whole can be characterized as "better than OK". Over half (53 percent) of our respondents, when weighted to College norms, called PGCC's community-wide racial climate "good" or "very good" while another four in ten (41 percent) considered it "OK" -- 94 percent in all. Only 7 percent said the climate here was poor or worse. This "better than OK" perception held true for all three campus groups -- for example, "good/very good": students 52, faculty 59 and staff 53 percents.

This basic pattern repeated itself also throughout the inter/intra-group climate ratings -- within student body, within employee force, between white faculty and nonwhite students and between nonwhite faculty and white students. In no instance did the proportion of "poor or worse" answers exceed 18 percent (staff evaluation of nonwhite student/white faculty relations).

There were, however, some interesting variations:

- Faculty members proved to be the most optimistic concerning the quality of campus race relations, if only to a moderate degree; on average, across the five climate ratings teacher proportions in the "good or better" category exceeded those both of students and staff by about 10 percent.

- Staff members, if in a minor and selective way, seemed relatively the most concerned. Only 38 percent gave the student body race relations a "good+" rating while 15 percent called them definitely poor; and 18 percent thought nonwhite student/white faculty sub-par (45 percent, the lowest figure for any group, gave "good+" ratings).

- Faculty and staff, while both are optimistic as groups, tend to disagree significantly on the extent that within-employee force race climate should be rated a "good+". The faculty is 18 percent more likely to do so. It is also 16 percent more likely to assign a positive mark to nonwhite student/white teacher climate and 14 percent more likely when it come to white student/nonwhite teacher climate.

- Notable faculty/student divergences of race climate opinion also exist, most importantly with respect to the quality of relations between the two[7]. Teacher respondents were 12 percent more prone to rate nonwhite student/white faculty relations good or better and 10 percent more prone in the case of white student/nonwhite faculty climate.

- Student body race climate is perceived by all groups to be the least "OK or better" (45 percent, all respondents). Next least OK, according to both students and staff, was nonwhite student/white faculty climate. The faculty, however, disagreed, placing whole College climate next to the bottom.

- Seen as most healthy by the student sub-sample was the racial climate between nonwhite teachers and white students (56 percent), followed by employee force climate (55 percent). Faculty and staff sub-samples, however, placed within-employee force race climate No. 1 (76 and 58 percent, respectively).

---

[7] Technically the largest faculty/student difference in the "good/very good" percentage occurred over the within-employee force climate rating -- 24 %. It is dangerous here, however, to put much weight on this comparison. Over 40 percent of the student sample disqualified themselves from answering, probably on grounds of ignorance of internal faculty, administrative and staff affairs. It is likely that this ignorance extends to most student raters as well.

Turning to perceptions of PGCC's racial climate in comparative perspective, we also find our respondents optimistic, or at least not pessimistic. First, do the College's student body and employee force think that race relations on campus have worsened over the last few years? This worry was a major reason the climate study was inaugurated, but the responses of our sample should allay any anxieties on this account. Fewer than one in five from any of the three respondent groups gives a "worse in the last two years" answer. Strong majorities across the sub-samples say that things have remained pretty much the same over this period and over a fifth actually report an improvement in their experience and judgement (students 28, faculty 21, staff 27 percent).

Second, do PGCCers believe our College's racial climate suffers in comparison with those of other schools? The results here are even more positive. Well over 80 percent of respondents in each group judge PGCC's quality of race relations at least on par and majorities or near majorities actually rate it superior (students 47, faculty 52, staff 41 percent).

Things look a bit different, however, if we examine racial climate perceptions by racial background (white/nonwhite). The table just below displays the percentage of positive evaluations to the five climate rating questions generated by each of the two broad racial groups for the College as a whole and within each of the three campus constituent groups. Also, the table provides a simple index of race opinion polarization (% positive rating nonwhite - % positive rating white). Plus index numbers here would indicate greater positivity on the part of nonwhites, minus numbers greater positivity on the part of whites.

P.G.C.C. RACIAL CLIMATE RATINGS*	ALL	P.G.C.C. NW	P.G.C.C. W	P.G.C.C. NW-W	Students NW	Students W	Students NW-W	Faculty NW	Faculty W	Faculty NW-W	Staff NW	Staff W	Staff NW-W
CLIMATE HERE/1992: % GOOD/VERY GOOD													
PGCC as a Whole	53	48	62	-14	49	58	-9	27	66	-39	42	62	-20
Within Student Body	45	39	54	-15	40	55	-15	16	54	-38	26	47	-21
Within Employee Force	55	47	67	-20	48	60	-12	38	85	-47	44	68	-22
W Fac vs NW Students	50	40	67	-27	42	68	-26	15	71	-56	31	56	-25
NW Fac vs W Students	56	52	67	-15	53	62	-9	35	74	-39	50	54	-4
Mean Positive	52	45	63	-18	46	61	-15	26	70	-44	39	57	-18
CLIMATE COMPARED: % BETTER/MUCH BETTER													
with Two Years Ago	28	31	22	9	31	22	9	25	20	5	28	26	2
with Other Schools	47	49	44	5	50	40	10	32	57	-25	38	43	-5
Mean Positive	38	40	33	7	41	31	10	29	39	-10	33	35	-2

* Excluding DK/NA responses

There are two main findings in this table. First, with the exception of nonwhites in one constituency group, majorities or near majorities of <u>both</u> racial elements give a "good+" rating on most of the racial climate indicators. In other words, both nonwhites and whites on campus tend to rate PGCC general, within-constituency and between-constituency racial climates as relatively healthy. The second finding, however, is that, collectively, nonwhites consistently give somewhat lower marks to the quality of campus intergroup relations than do whites -- <u>all</u> of the racial difference index scores in the table's top half are negative.

Many of the detailed findings derivable from the table are also interesting:

- Disagreement between racial sub-samples over the quality of PGCC race relations directly rated is lowest within the student constituency (-15), next lowest within the staff constituency (-18). Neither level of racial opinion polarization is dramatic from a statistical point of view.

- On the other hand, directly measured race climate opinion is dramatically polarized within the PGCC faculty (-44). Nonwhite faculty respondents are, by far, the least optimistic of the six constituency-by-race sub-samples[8]; while white faculty members very much exceed all others in their tendency to give positive race climate assessments (mean % good+ 70).

- The second least controversial evaluation of racial climate involved relations between nonwhite faculty and white students (-15 nonwhite/white respondent % difference of good+ rating across the three constituencies); the most controversial was its reverse -- relations between white faculty and nonwhite students (-27 mean % difference).

The last mentioned finding focuses our attention on the most common course-giving circumstance on the PGCC campus -- classes the majority of whose students are nonwhite being taught by white faculty members. What if we directly compare the answers of our nonwhite student sample with those of white faculty respondents on the question of the quality of nonwhite student/white faculty relations:

White Faculty/Nonwhite Student
Racial Climate Rating

	Very Poor/ Poor	OK	Good/ Very Good
White Students	6 %	26 %	68 %
White Staff	10 %	34 %	56 %
White Faculty	6 %	23 %	71 %
Nonwhite Students	13 %	46 %	42 %
% Difference	-7 %	-23 %	+29 %
Nonwhite Staff	29 %	40 %	31 %
Nonwhite Faculty	32 %	53 %	14 %

The central rows of the above table tell the main story: White faculty and nonwhite students importantly disagree over how well they get along together. A large majority of white faculty (71 percent) say everything is fine between them and their nonwhite students; but a plurality of their students (46 percent) say that their relationship is just "OK" (though very few state that it is definitely poor). This is not a matter of which side is objectively "right" about a relationship. Whatever the "objective" truth, if the involved parties disagree significantly on whether they are happy together, this degree of perceptual disjunction may very well, in itself, be feeding back into the relationship many conflicting assumptions and expectations with unfortunate consequences for classroom dynamics.

---

[8] Which is not to say that nonwhite faculty as a group believe PGCC race relations to be poor. The fall-off in this subsample tends to be from the "good/very good" category to the "OK" rather than to the "poor/very poor" category. For example, on the item asking for a College-wide rating, the full nonwhite faculty percentages are as follows: Good+ 27 %, OK 61 %, Poor- 13 %.

The subplot, discernable in the remainder of the table, is noteworthy as well. The top and bottom thirds show how the outsiders to the white faculty/nonwhite student body relationship view how well these two sides get along. With the exception of the white student respondents (whose evaluations are in substantial agreement with those of their white teachers), the three remaining sub-samples rate white faculty/nonwhite student climate less good than white faculty respondents as a group do.

Still more interesting, fewer nonwhite staff (31 percent) and nonwhite faculty (14 percent) give positive marks to the relationship than do even the nonwhite students (42 percent), and a near-third of these actually rate white faculty/nonwhite student interaction as poor (29 and 32 percent, respectively). This raises the question of whether the true state of affairs concerning a relationship can be worse than that assessed by the most negative partner in that relationship. It is possible that outsiders might see aspects of interpersonal dynamics that insiders might not, but it is also possible that outsiders might over-read a situation.

Indirect Measures of PGCC Racial Climate. The findings just discussed were based on direct racial climate rating items. Such measures are efficient for getting at perceived institutional climate overall and within and between various constituent groups, but leave the concept of climate itself ambiguously general.

To get at the specific structural dimensions of racial climate at PGCC, we applied a series of indirect probes which came at the notion of "racial climate" from a number of different angles: (1) **Racial Inclusivity** - the degree to which community members accept multiculturalism as a personal value, view ethnic diversity as a benefit to the group, and participate in a pluralist social life transcending traditional divisions; (2) **Racial Amity** - the degree to which community members from different racial backgrounds interact without social friction, respect one another as equals and refrain from acting on prejudice; (3) **Collective Pluralist Effort** - the degree to which a community intentionally organizes itself to promote racial inclusivity and fairness, and to resist residual racism; (4) **Climate-Related Psychological Stress** - the degree to which individuals experience the racial climate as stressful (e.g., feelings of discomfort, anger, fear or alienation).

The table below reviews the reactions of the three PGCC constituencies to our battery of indirect racial climate indicators, each a 5-point strongly disagree-strongly agree item shown in 3-point collapsed format and arranged according to the four aspect scheme just discussed. All table items here have positive wording orientations, that is -- agreement with them always expresses the perception of a happy or desirable state of affairs with respect to racial climate. Items whose original questionnaire wording asked for agreement that a negative situation of some sort obtained were re-worked into a positive form for the question -- e.g., "The racial climate at PGCC makes me feel uncomfortable" to "... [does not] make me feel uncomfortable." Items that have been re-polarized in this fashion are always flagged by the presence of brackets ("[ ]") where the specific wording change has been made.

The most general finding is that respondent racial climate opinion continues to be fairly optimistic. In almost every instance and almost regardless of respondent sub-sample or question aspect majorities or large pluralities picked positive answers. Put another way: Whether student, faculty member or staffer, the average respondent proved more likely than not to agree that healthy levels of both racial inclusivity and racial amity existed at this college, that community members made real efforts to keep and improve upon this situation, and that personally he or she felt good about functioning in the current racial climate.

P.G.C.C. CLIMATE OPINION*	PGCC** -	0	+	Students -	0	+	Faculty -	0	+	Staff -	0	+
Racial Inclusivity												
Pluralism valuable to me	7	24	70	7	25	68	2	13	85	4	18	78
Diversity PGCC's advantage	15	36	45	16	37	47	11	29	59	13	36	49
Groups [do] talk, mingle	21	25	54	21	25	54	21	27	52	22	28	50
Racial Amity												
[Never] hurt anyone racially	6	5	90	6	4	90	4	6	90	3	8	90
[No] putdowns of nonwhites	20	19	61	21	19	60	15	13	73	20	17	62
Race tensions exaggerated	40	27	34	40	26	34	40	24	36	34	32	34
Community Effort												
Proud of PGCC's equal access	8	25	67	9	27	65	4	14	82	9	20	71
PGCCers try to fight racism	9	25	66	10	27	63	4	5	91	9	17	74
Col race policies excellent	17	33	50	16	35	49	15	27	58	21	29	50
Psychological Effect												
[Not] uncomfrtable w/climate	12	15	73	12	15	73	10	15	75	15	18	67
[Not] upset w/racial events	23	21	57	23	20	57	11	22	67	26	26	48
Mean Positive	--	--	60	--	--	60	--	--	70	--	--	61

* Excluding DK/NA responses; rounded percentages may not sum to 100 %
** Key to Column headings: % Strongly Disagree/Disagree (-), Neither (0), Strongly Agree/Agree (+).

There were, however, some interesting specific findings in the table that importantly add to our understanding of the psychosocial dynamics at work here and in some cases serve to qualify the general cheery message:

- As before, faculty appeared the most positive College component concerning PGCC's racial climate, although not exaggeratedly so. Across the 11 indirect climate indicators, the teacher respondent group scored a mean 70 percent positive, compared with students (60 percent) and staff (61 percent).

- A significantly higher proportion of respondents (70 percent) accepted a multicultural student body as a personal ideal than accepted the practical proposition that such a student body, and the pluralism of view-point it implies, is one of PGCC's great strengths (45 percent).

- Students were notably less likely (though far from unlikely) to endorse College pluralism as a personal value (68 percent) than either teachers (85 percent) or staffers (78 percent).

- More than half (54 percent) of our respondents thought that the campus's racial **pluralism** had been successfully translated into racial **integration**; only about one in five disagreed (21 percent), saying that PGCC ethnic groups do not mingle socially. This finding did not vary in any noticeable way across the College's three constituencies.

- Opinions on the level of racial amity varied much more than did those on racial inclusivity. When asked if he or she had ever been personally responsible for a racial incident on campus, hardly any respondent pleaded guilty (6 percent, sample-wide). Around a fifth, however, saw a tendency of white PGCCers to treat nonwhites condescendingly, and a full 40 percent thought talk of the level of racial tensions here **not** exaggerated, 6 percent more than those who though it was.

- The majority of respondents gave PGCC high marks on making a community effort to combat racism: positive on taking pride in the College's equal educational stance (67 percent), on community member work to create an inclusive environment (66 percent), and on the excellence of the College's racial policies (50 percent).

- Faculty optimism showed itself particularly strongly in response to the Community Effort items. For example, 91 percent thought PGCCers fought hard against racism, compared with "only" 74 percent among staff and 63 percent among students.

- On the two emotional response items, respondents also gave as a group the sort of answers which spelled well for the campus racial climate. Over seven in ten (73 percent) told us that they felt not uncomfortable with the present state of race relations, and almost six in ten (57 percent) told us that nothing on campus had happened recently of a racial sort to make them angry or upset.

- Staff respondents tended to be somewhat less emotionally content with the current racial environment than either student or faculty respondents.

The above pattern is curious. On one hand, respondents -- employees no less than students -- tended to assess PGCC's racial climate as healthy when it came to perceived levels of racial inclusivity, community pro-pluralist effort and psychological comfort. On the other had, they appeared far more ambivalent concerning how to evaluate racial climate here in terms of racial amity. While practically no one admitted complicity in any racial incidents (an understandable self-defensive response), our sample split (three "No" to two "Yes/Maybe") on whether white-on-black discrimination was positively occuring on campus, at least in its mild "subtle putdown" form, and two-thirds expressed some worry that talk of "racial tensions" may not be out of line. Were respondent perceptions, then, contradictory?

Not necessarily so. "Racial climate," after all, is a complex phenomenon consisting of many dimensions. Respondents may have been honestly expressing qualified approval of some aspects of PGCC's racial climate while registering confusion and anxiety over others -- in particular, over the level of inter-ethnic group friction. The full story on racial climate being related in respondent answers may be that while community ideals are lofty, member efforts to be fair and friendly laudable and the overall result emotionally tolerable, still we may not have quite mastered the actual art of getting along with one another.

The next table, which breaks out responses to the racial climate aspect items by race as well as by College constituency, considerably deepens the analysis.

P.G.C.C. CLIMATE CLIMATE OPINION*	ALL	PGCC** NW	W	NW-W	Students NW	W	NW-W	Faculty NW	W	NW-W	Staff NW	W	NW-W
Racial Inclusivity													
I value pluralism	70	71	67	4	70	62	18	93	84	9	81	75	6
Diversity a PGCC plus	49	49	42	7	48	45	3	60	59	1	61	57	4
Groups [do] mingle	54	51	59	-8	51	60	-9	45	54	-9	47	53	-6
Racial Amity													
[Never] discriminated	90	89	92	-3	89	92	-3	86	90	-4	90	89	2
[No] putdowns of NWs	61	45	82	-37	46	84	-38	43	78	-35	40	77	-37
Tensions exaggerated	34	25	48	-23	25	51	-26	10	42	-32	23	42	-19
Community Effort													
Proud of Col equal ed	67	62	74	-12	62	70	-8	72	85	-13	61	79	-18
PGCCers fight racism	66	57	79	-22	57	74	-17	67	96	-29	59	85	-26
Race policy excellent	50	43	60	-17	44	59	-15	32	63	-31	37	58	-21
Psychological Effect													
[Not] uncomf w/climate	73	78	65	13	78	63	15	70	76	-6	72	64	8
[Not] upset by events	57	57	57	0	58	56	2	66	68	-2	43	52	-9

* Excluding DK/NA responses; rounded percentages may not sum to 100 %

** Key to Column headings: % Strongly Disagree/Disagree (-), Neither (0), Strongly Agree/Agree (+).

• Items tapping the pluralist values dimension of racial climate divide nonwhites and white little. Opinion is almost homogenous within all three constituencies that to a greater or lesser extent the College and its members stand behind the ideal of a multicultural community.

• Much the same could be said concerning responses to items probing for the psychological impact of the current racial climate. Nonwhites and whites tend to agree that PGCC's environment is emotionally relatively unstressful. The only significant difference occured among student respondents: nonwhites somewhat more frequently expressed comfort with present racial circumstances (+15 percent) than did whites.

• More controversial proved to be questions of community efforts to promote racial peace and justice. On all three items in this group, nonwhites consistently tended to affirm PGCC efforts and practices substantially less often than whites: on average 13 percent less often among student respondents, 24 percent less often among faculty, and 22 percent less often among staff.

• But the most controversial area of all was Racial Amity. On the question of the absence of racially condenscending attitudes and practices among white PGCCers, nonwhite-white agreement differences registered -38 percent within the student constituency, -35 within the faculty constituency and -37 within the staff constituency; on talk of racial tensions being exaggerated, the following agreement differences appeared: -26 for the student group, -32 for the teacher group and -19 for the staff group.

The findings just set forth reinforce our sense that below the placid surface some significant turbulent racial currents do exist at PGCC. Specifically, nonwhites are far less sanguine about campus racial amity than whites, and a sizable minority of nonwhites even evidence doubt over the administration's and general community's good will in pursuing racial fairness.

General Racial Attitudes. The last set of findings in this section deals with PGCCer race-related attitudes and perceptions beyond the campus. The table below displays the student/ faculty/staff answers resulting from a series of 5-point agree/disagree items concerning national inter-ethnic issues:

OPINIONS ON NATIONAL RACE RELATED ISSUES*	P.G.C.C. - 0 +	Students - 0 +	Faculty - 0 +	Staff - 0 +
U.S. race relations much worse	15 26 59	14 26 60	22 27 52	15 25 60
Hard workers always get ahead	28 23 49	29 23 48	20 21 59	30 20 51
U.S. is a land of opportunity	37 31 32	38 31 30	24 29 47	35 33 33
Be for own ethnic group	42 29 29	41 28 30	49 30 22	46 33 21
U.S. ed system is too European	34 26 40	32 26 41	49 25 25	38 25 37
Give qualified NWs a job edge	39 23 37	38 23 39	49 22 29	49 24 27

* Excluding DK/NA responses

The differences between the figures shown here and those of previous campus-centered tables are striking: in general, respondents were far less optimistic and more polarized and ethnocentric over national racial climate and related issues:

- On the national racial environment rating question, across the board solid constituency majorities told us that intergroup relations had deteriorated badly in recent years.

- On the two items designed to test perceptions of the validity of the American egalitarian self-image, while majorities or near majorities in all three groups agreed that in the end talent and application would overcome any obstacles to advancement, students and staff were badly split over whether U.S. society truly constituted a level playing field.

- On the two items measuring ethnocentrism and cultural conflict: Most students, teachers and staffers rejected the proposition that one should live to advance the goals of one's own ethnic group; however, the more specific question concerning lack of alternative cultural viewpoints to the European in U.S. education, a plurality of students agreed (41 percent), staffers split (38 percent disagreeing/37 agreeing) and a virtual majority of faculty (49 percent) disagreed.

- On the question of redressing employment imbalances through racial quotas our student sample was almost exactly polarized (38 percent against/39 percent for), while employees showed a strong negative plurality (49 percent).

OPINIONS ON NATIONAL RACE RELATED ISSUES: % AGREEING*	ALL	P.G.C.C. NW	W	NW-W	Students NW	W	NW-W	Faculty NW	W	NW-W	Staff NW	W	NW-W
Race rels much worse	59	67	47	20	66	46	23	74	46	28	72	52	20
Hard workers get ahead	49	36	69	-33	37	72	-35	35	64	-29	33	65	-32
US land of opportunity	32	20	50	-30	20	51	-31	23	52	-29	17	44	-27
Be for own ethnic grp	29	38	15	23	38	15	23	32	13	19	32	18	14
US ed is too European	40	55	16	39	54	16	39	65	16	49	67	16	51
Give NWs job edge	37	50	19	31	50	17	33	48	25	23	43	16	27

* Excluding DK/NA responses

Even more revealing are the between-race differences in response to the national items, depicted in the table above. Here we find intergroup disagreements far transcending differences across College constituencies. Nonwhites as a whole were 20 percent more likely than whites at PGCC to perceive a sharp decline in national race relations, 30 percent less likely to view America as egalitarian, 33 percent less likely to see hard work and talent as an effective equalizer, 23 percent more likely to value ethnocentrism as a way of life, 39 percent more likely to spot too much Eurocentrism in U.S. education, and 31 percent more likely to endorse racial job quotas in principle.

One might argue that since such profound nonwhite-white differences seem at present to be restricted to "off-campus" attitudes and perceptions, there is little ground for anxiety. On the other hand, clearly the potential for a vastly increased degree of future racial polarization exists. The distinction between "campus issues" and "national issues" is somewhat artificial and there is always the chance that some points of the national racial tension might become the foci of campus politics.

Given that the College now features a majority nonwhite student body and a basically white employee force, the two "national issues" most likely to break into PGCC's policy deliberations are a multicultural curriculum and racial job quotas. In fact, the planned multiculturalizing of the College curriculum has already begun. The point is that there is a great difference between a modulated, tactful and respectful community dialogue, such as that which has brought about the current administrative response, and a racially divisive ideologized debate, which so far has been avoided.

To further illustrate the danger of allowing such a national issue to politicize campus life, let's look at the full three-way crosstabulation of perception of the overly European basis of U.S. education by both constituency and race[9]. The pattern is dramatically apparent. In all three constituent subsamples, the nonwhite and white attitude distributions are almost mirror opposites with large majorities occupying diametric poles -- for example, among faculty respondents: 65 percent nonwhites agreeing, 57 percent whites disagreeing!

---

[9] Granted that agreement with this general proposition is not the same thing as endorsing the specific proposal that American educational policy should be rigorously multicultural, the second does logically presuppose the first; thus there should be a high degree of attitude correlation between the two.

"American education is based too much on European history and values"

	Percent		
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Nonwhite Students	21	25	54
White Students	55	29	16
Nonwhite Faculty	15	19	65
White Faculty	57	27	16
Nonwhite Staff	11	23	67
White Staff	57	28	16

Employee-Specific Attitudes and Perceptions

Reactions to PGCC's Racial Climate. The survey questionnaire administered to College employees contained a series of items designed to gauge reactions to PGCC's racial climate as it relates specifically to the concerns of faculty and staff. These were cast in the now familiar 5-point disagree/agree format, and the percentage results for the entire employee force are shown in the table below. The items displayed there are all worded in the "positive" mode (agreement indicating an attitude inducive of racial harmony or a perception suggesting a happy state of racial affairs); where re-working of an item's language was necessary to achieve positive sense, changes are marked by brackets ([ ]) and original response categories have been assigned reversed meanings (e.g., "disagree" becoming "agree"). Item order follows the percentage of positive ("agree") answers, high to low.

EMPLOYEE-SPECIFIC RACE CLIMATE OPINIONS [Employees Only]*	Percent		
	DIS	NEUT	AGR
[No] thought of leaving because of climate	5	11	84
PGCC is a friendly, caring place to work	5	21	75
Quotas [not] the way to PGCC job balance	13	15	72
Employees for true multiracial community	10	27	64
NW workrs [not] putdown in little ways	25	15	60
College NW promotion record is excellent	24	23	54
College NW hiring record is excellent	20	29	52
[No] special racial ill will among employees	37	24	39
Jobs here merit-based, not based on politics	43	21	37

* Excluding DK/NA responses

Employees proved to be in almost unanimous positive agreement (84 percent) that whatever the College's racial climate might be, it created no impulse for leaving PGCC employ. One reason for this may be that almost as large a majority of employees (75 percent) found the College a very friendly, caring place in which to work. But the last "consensus" item was perhaps the most interesting: more than seven in ten (72 percent) stated that redressing any inequities in the current employee force racial balance ought not to be approached by means of a formal quota system.

The middle set of items generated more moderate levels of positive agreement. Over three-fifths thought that their workmates tried hard to achieve the feeling of a happy multiracial family within the employee force (64 percent) and rejected the notion that white workers tended to show disrespect to their nonwhite mates in small ways (60 percent). They also, by simple majorities, gave a grade of "excellent" to the College's record on nonwhite promotion (54 percent) and hiring (52 percent).

Only two items generated split or overall negative opinions: Employee respondents divided 39 percent agree/37 percent disagree on whether the true level of racial ill feeling within the force was acknowledged by all concerned, and 43 percent disagree/37 percent agree on whether PGCC hiring and promotion decisions were merit-driven.

The overall impression is that College employees gave qualified approval of what it is like to work at PGCC given the present state of the racial environment. As a work place, it is seen as rewarding, supportive, idealistic and reasonably fair -- both institutionally and socially. But percolating at a low rate beneath this placid surface there also seems to be sufficient racial roiling to cause concern. One out of four or five employees did have serious doubts about College commitment to minority advancement and workmate acceptance of racial differences, enough to infect pluralities or near-pluralities with worry over unspoken intergroup resentments and administration racial politics.

Thus prompted to dig further, we noted that the above analysis relied solely on whole work force response only and wondered if differing job and especially racial subsample responses were not being masked by grand averages. The next table exhibits the same data broken out by these divisions, and includes the simple nonwhite % - white % index device to highlight any racial polarizations of opinion occurring. Items appear on the table in order of degree of racial opinion polarization so indicated by the All Respondent index figure.

EMPLOYEE-SPECIFIC RACE CLIMATE OPINIONS [Employees Only]*		FACULTY - 0 +	STAFF - 0 +	% AGREE NW - W Fac Stf All
NW workrs [not] putdown	NW	53 19 29	56 16 28	-51 -43 -47
	W	9 11 80	11 18 71	
NW promotion record excellent	NW	49 17 35	48 27 25	-38 -35 -41
	W	9 18 73	10 25 65	
Job quotas [not] the way	NW	27 30 43	26 25 49	-40 -34 -35
	W	9 9 83	6 11 83	
NW hiring record excellent	NW	41 27 33	29 41 31	-29 -35 -33
	W	13 26 62	12 22 66	
[No] racial ill will here	NW	59 17 24	52 24 24	-21 -23 -22
	W	28 27 45	30 23 47	
Employees for multiracialism	NW	16 34 50	18 26 56	-21 -9 -14
	W	2 27 71	10 24 65	
PGCC is a friendly place	NW	13 17 70	6 29 65	-7 -15 -11
	W	4 20 77	3 17 80	
[No] thought of leaving	NW	5 8 87	6 19 76	-2 -9 -9
	W	5 7 89	6 10 85	
Jobs here are merit-based	NW	58 12 30	49 14 37	-7 -2 -3
	W	40 24 37	37 24 39	

* Excluding DK/NA responses

Unsurprisingly, the three "consensus" items just discussed -- employee striving for a multiracial community, work place friendliness, and desire to stick with one's job despite the racial climate proved to be among the four least inter-race controversial. The fourth and apparently least controversial, however, turned out to be one of the **least** consensual items -- workers of both race groups showed very similar levels of strong division over the question of whether the administration plays politics with College jobs. Index scores for these items were -14 percent or lower.

But much more important was the extremely high levels of inter-race disagreement brought to the surface by the remaining items -- all index scores between -22 percent and -47 percent! Generating the most inter-race separation of opinion was the question of the existence of subtle white worker condescension towards nonwhite employees: 53 percent of nonwhite faculty and 56 percent of nonwhite staff told us this was the norm while 80 percent of white faculty and 71 percent of white staff denied this occurred. Only somewhat less dramatic patterns of polarization were also generated by the items dealing with assessment of nonwhite hiring and promotion history, the need for a formal racial job quota, and the prevalence of unadmitted racial ill feeling.

All of these except the last we had previous classed as positive consensus items based on entire employee sample percentages. It is now clear that such consensus was a statistical artifact created by the two-thirds majority held by whites in the employee force. Underneath, what tends to happen in employee response to important questions relating to the health of PGCC's racial climate as particularly it impacts on workers is: the very strong positive response of the large white majority overwhelms the much less positive response of the nonwhite minority.

But while it is true that nonwhite employees are considerably **less** happy as a group with many crucial aspects of the state of worker-impacting race relations on campus, we must underline that this is **not** the same thing as concluding that they are absolutely **unhappy**.

First, the level of satisfaction with campus racial climate may and in fact does vary depending upon which aspect of this complex phenomenon we are focusing on. Nonwhite responses to the white condescension, nonwhite promotion and negative race feeling items result in near or small negative majorities and thus make a case for the term "unhappy." But among nonwhite workers only faculty as a group come close to registering real unhappiness with College nonwhite hiring policy (41 percent disagree that it should be called "excellent") while nonwhite staff seem relatively unnegative (only 29 percent reject the "excellent" grade). And on the question of formal job quotas, only around a quarter of nonwhite respondents from either job category were unhappy enough to demand them; near majorities in both cases in fact rejected the need outright.

Second, forcing a single characterization on whole groups often is empirically inappropriate and may lead to dangerously misleading conclusions. The truth of the matter is that even in the worst case of nonwhite "unhappiness" with an aspect of PGCC's employee racial climate there exists an effective division of nonwhite opinion. While a bit over 50 percent do feel white workers putdown nonwhite workers in small ways, still almost 30 percent deny this happens as a rule and another around 20 percent hedge their bets.

We can conservatively summarize our findings on employee race climate attitudes and perceptions as follows: When it comes to assessing the quality of racial climate as it impacts on the work place

- on most climate aspects, white workers are overwhelming optimistic

- nonwhite workers, as a group, are almost always considerably less positive

- on the matters of personal treatment by white coworkers and administration promotion history, nonwhites overall approach genuine unhappiness; even so, a significant minority of the nonwhite group remains positive

- nonwhite and white employees do tend to converge in holding overall positive opinions concerning the prevalence of a supportive and idealistic atmosphere in the work place; almost no one from either group wants to resign his or her job here over racial problems

- nonwhite and white employees also tend to converge in being similarly divided, and even somewhat negative, in judging whether job decisions are made on a merit basis rather than on a "political" one

The last point here we would like to make is that the depth of racial tension and divergent racial perception among PGCC workers we have just uncovered did not appear evident until we shifted the focus from the racial climate of the general College community to the more immediate racial climate within the labor force itself. Only when the research lens was turned to that sphere with concrete and personal relevance to this particular respondent group were we able to delineate the field of employee racial sentiments with due accuracy. PGCC may be more of a "community" than most institutions of higher learning, but it still falls short of being a highly integrated one; College constituencies are still primarily concerned with, and more sensitive concerning, their own little worlds.

Special Faculty Attitudes and Perceptions related to Race. PGCC's business is education and the main educational process is what takes place between teacher and student in the classroom. For this reason, we decided to include a special battery of items for faculty response only to gauge classroom racial climate from the perspective of PGCC's teachers and to probe race-related primarily white faculty attitudes towards the primarily nonwhite PGCC student body.

CLASSROOM RACIAL CLIMATE [Faculty Only]		Percent - 0 +	Agr NW-W
Race tensions [not] disturbing - my classes	ALL	7 9 85	0
	NW	9 7 85	
	W	6 9 85	
Race diversity helps in class -	ALL	11 15 74	+17
	NW	0 12 88	
	W	14 15 71	
Can work multicultural material - into my teaching	ALL	5 16 79	+22
	NW	2 2 96	
	W	6 20 74	
[No] more at ease with students of my own race [than w/others]	ALL	11 14 75	+14
	NW	11 3 86	
	W	11 17 72	
Expect [same] of nonwhite students [that I do of white students]	ALL	14 12 75	+22
	NW	2 7 92	
	W	17 13 70	

The above table reports faculty responses to these items, all which take the usual 5-point disagree/agree format and are oriented (with re-wording and response category reversal where necessary) so that agreement indicates a racially positive opinion or evaluation.

According to our instructors as a group, it would seem that the situation in the classroom is well in hand:

- In terms of the educational process, 85 percent deny that race tensions have been disrupting their lessons, rather 74 percent said that the racial pluralism of their charges proved a positive educational benefit and almost four out of five told us that they would have no difficulty responding to classroom ethnic diversity by adopting a more multicultural approach to their teaching.

- In terms of teacher-student race interaction, three-quarters claimed that they felt no less at ease with students from a race group not their own than with students from the same background as theirs. Furthermore, the same proportion assured us that their expectation for the performance of students were uncorrelated with course enrollee race.

The question immediate emerges as to whether these responses tended to vary by the racial background of the respondent. The answer is technically yes but essentially no. Technically, white faculty always fell at least 14 percentage points off nonwhite levels of positive agreement on these items (except for the one concerning race tension classroom disruption where positive response levels were equal). Essentially, however, white faculty also proved so very positive that this gap hardly seems to matter much. For example, white teacher agreement with a multiculturalization of their courses was 22 percent less than nonwhite teacher agreement -- but this agreement level still bordered on consensus: 74 percent. Similarly, while white faculty agreed 22 percent less often than nonwhite faculty that student race made no difference in their educational expectations, a overwhelming majority of seven in ten did claim this to be true.

But before this glowing faculty report of classroom harmony is accepted at face value, we must remind ourselves of an earlier finding of this study: white faculty and nonwhite students, who form the great majority of their separate constituencies, disagree seriously over the quality of white faculty-nonwhite student climate. Over seven in ten white teachers (71 percent) rated that set of relations as either "good" or "very good"; only about four in ten (42 percent) nonwhite students agreed. Furthermore, nonwhite faculty were even less kind than nonwhite students in this regard. Only 14 percent of these classroom observers thought white faculty-nonwhite student relations good or better, 53 percent rated it just "OK," and 32 percent panned it outright.

Finally, an equally serious challenge to optimistic faculty perceptions of classroom racial climate comes in the form of nonwhite student reports of classroom episodes of racial bias, discussed in the first study on student perceptions of PGCC racial climate. There we saw that nearly a third (30 percent) of our minority course enrollees claimed to have been the victim of at least one racially biased act by a (presumably white) teacher. The sort of bias actions meant here included unfair assignment or test grades (13 percent), lack of faculty helpfulness (13 percent), unfair course grades (11 percent), being ignored in class (10 percent), race stereotypical remarks by faculty (10 percent), race insensitive assignments and readings (5 percent) and being putdown in class by a teacher (4 percent). This despite the fact that white faculty, as was true of all other groups, were practically unanimous, in denying that they had ever done anything racially motivated to hurt other members of the College community.

The point right now is not whose perceptions are right. We lack any data at present to make an informed judgment. The real point is that the partners in this classroom marriage are dangerously misreading one another and their relationship. White faculty, as a group, seem to think everything is fine, while nonwhite students harbor many grievances. These cross-readings are themselves an important problem and doubtless a source of much misunderstanding and hurt feeling.

Employee experiences of Racial Bias

Evaluations of employee intergroup relations by workers and measurement of the health of worker racial attitudes have been the two main approaches thus far used in this study to gauge the quality of the PGCC employee force racial climate. In this final section we will present the findings of a third approach -- an examination of the number and types of worker-reported experiences of race-based discrimination.

This was set up by means of a questionnaire checklist of possible race bias experiences. Respondents were asked whether they had ever been an on-campus victim of each checklist bias mentioned or whether they had ever heard of specific incidents of that type. If a bias list is comprehensive enough, the virtue of this method is completeness of coverage of the full spectrum of possible racial discrimination and conflict (reliance on respondent memory and subjective judgement as to what may constitute bias is minimized). The main drawback was that the degree of prevalence of racial bias in a community could not be established directly. The checklist format was too elaborate to permit the inclusion of follow-up questions concerning the frequency with which each of the different victimizations had been experienced (e.g., daily, often, only once or twice while a PGCC employee). However, we were able to construct an overall indirect measure of bias prevalence -- the number of different types of personally experienced bias.

Finally, we were also interested in how respondents reacted to experiencing on-campus racial discrimination and conflict. Knowing which strategies victims tended to adopt or fail to adopt to cope with racial bias could tell us whether such misfortunes were being constructively handled, left to fester as emotional wounds or were serving as triggers for tension heightening, actual retaliation or anti-institutional action. This too was researched by means of a questionnaire checklist.

Degree and Variety of Racial Victimization. The table to follow shows the percentages of respondents admitted to having ever been a victim of some form of racial discrimination or conflict while a employee. The table is organized by type of experienced bias, respondent job category and respondent racial background.

The table's bottom line finding is that almost two-fifths of our employee respondents (39 percent) said that they had suffered some kind of racial bias during their tenure here (a figure interestingly that does not change with respondent racial background -- at this level of generality whites and nonwhite share in racial hurting equally). Two different types of bias incident happened at least once to almost a quarter (23 percent); about 16 percent fell victim to three or more different types of racial bias -- in each case, nonwhite bias experience rates exceeded that of whites by about 10 percent.

The true import of these figures -- especially the large 39 percentage -- is somewhat difficult to establish since frequency of experience cannot be known and "any type" can refer to something as relatively trivial as hearing a joke at the expense of one's racial group to being denied promotion because of one's ethnicity. Suffice it to say, however, that however one takes it a near two-fifth experience rate of some kind of racial bias is a fact difficult to shrug off. It must at least indicate a level of breakdown in racial civility capable of some significant damage to the employment force effectiveness and morale. (Strangely enough, the employee overall bias experience rate is almost exactly the same as that among the student body, so this can be considered a campus-wide phenomenon.)

RACIAL INCIDENTS: % HAPPENED TO ME*	ALL	Race			Fac/Staff			Faculty			Staff		
		NW	W	NW-W	F	S	F-S	NW	W	NW-W	NW	W	NW-W
Language Incidents	**25**	**38**	**19**	**19**	**19**	**30**	**-11**	**29**	**17**	**12**	**41**	**21**	**20**
Ethnic Joke(s)	19	14	21	-7	18	19	-1	13	19	-6	15	23	-8
Race Remark(s)-Peer	9	14	7	7	8	11	-3	8	8	0	17	7	10
Race Remark(s)-Sup.	4	6	4	2	3	6	-3	2	3	-1	7	5	2
Social Incidents	**21**	**36**	**15**	**21**	**15**	**27**	**-12**	**37**	**10**	**27**	**35**	**20**	**15**
Condescension-Peers	12	23	7	16	7	16	-9	19	5	14	24	10	14
Condescension-Sups.	9	9	8	1	6	11	-5	4	7	-3	11	10	1
Socially excluded	7	8	6	2	8	6	2	11	7	4	6	6	0
Feuding at Work	3	5	1	4	1	4	-3	0	1	-1	7	2	5
Job Incidents	**16**	**33**	**8**	**25**	**11**	**21**	**-10**	**38**	**5**	**33**	**32**	**13**	**19**
Not Promoted	10	14	8	6	8	11	-3	19	5	14	12	11	1
Poorer Assignments	8	12	6	6	5	11	-6	4	5	-1	15	8	7
Ignored at Meetings	8	10	6	4	6	9	-3	11	4	7	10	9	1
Work Not Recognized	8	13	6	7	6	10	-4	13	4	9	13	8	5
Student Incidents	**15**	**10**	**18**	**-8**	**19**	**12**	**7**	**20**	**19**	**1**	**7**	**15**	**-8**
ANY INCIDENT	**39**	**38**	**39**	**-1**	**37**	**40**	**-3**	**39**	**37**	**2**	**38**	**41**	**-3**
2+ Incident Types	23	30	20	10	20	26	-6	28	19	9	30	23	7
3+ Incident Types	16	22	13	9	13	18	-5	25	10	15	21	16	5

* "Didn't Happen to Me" = No Event + Heard of Only

The table's more specific findings can be summarized as follows:

• Experiencing "language" bias (inadvertent or deliberate verbal insults of various kinds) was the most widely reported form of racial victimization (25 percent, all employees); the racial joke told in the work place led the list in this category and also overall (19 percent reported).

• Experiencing "social" bias (condescension from colleagues or supervisors of another racial background, informal exclusion, a pattern of racial feuding in the work place) was the second most reported form of victimization (21 percent, all employees); being slighted by one's peers was the most common form (12 percent reported).

• Career-related and student-to-employee varieties of discrimination and conflict were not widely reported (16 and 15 percent respectively, all employees). Of these kinds, failure to be advanced on the job because of race was the principle problem mentioned (10 percent).

• White employee experiences with racial bias centered on hearing racially insulting work place humor (21 percent reported) and being slighted, insulted or abused by a nonwhite student (18 percent). Otherwise, white racial victimization seemed minimal.

• Nonwhite employee complaints of victimization covered a wider variety of forms of racial discrimination, but were particularly noticeable in the area of job bias --fully a third of all nonwhite employees reported such experiences. A disproportion (compared with white

employees) mentioned each form listed here: promotion problems (14 percent), recognition problems (13 percent), assignment problems (12 percent), problem at work meetings (10 percent).

• Differences in the patterns of experienced discrimination between faculty and staff are mostly a function of the different proportions of nonwhite employees in each job category -- with one understandable exception: race notwithstanding, faculty are somewhat more likely to experience race trouble from students.

Employee Reactions to Racial Bias Experiences. How did the two in five PGCC employees who suffered some sort of racial victimization handle their negative experiences? The last table in this report answers this question:

RESPONSE TO RACE INCIDENT [EVENT VICTIMS ONLY (38 %)]	% ONLY CONSIDERED DOING or ACTUALLY DID							% ACTUALLY DID						
		Faculty			Staff				Faculty			Staff		
	ALL	NW	W	NW-W	NW	W	NW-W	ALL	NW	W	NW-W	NW	W	NW-W
SOUGHT ADVICE	40	54	48	6	33	31	2	36	38	46	-8	29	30	-1
Talk w/Friend	31	43	38	5	28	21	7	25	28	34	-6	20	18	2
Talk w/Workmate	29	48	36	12	27	19	8	22	22	31	-9	19	15	4
Talk w/Superior	30	37	37	0	27	22	5	26	16	34	-18	27	19	8
ENDED RELATIONS	11	21	9	12	15	6	9	6	15	6	9	6	4	2
End Relatnship	9	21	7	14	13	5	8	5	15	5	10	4	3	1
End Col.Activity	3	5	4	1	3	2	1	2	0	1	-1	2	2	0
DISCUSION w/PERP	35	61	38	23	31	28	5	21	49	26	23	12	15	-3
CONFLICT w/PERP	13	15	10	5	21	10	11	3	5	4	1	3	3	0
Return abuse	13	15	10	5	21	9	12	3	5	4	1	3	2	1
Physical Fight	4	5	1	4	9	4	5	1	5	0	5	0	1	-1
FORMAL REDRESS	12	26	11	15	13	9	4	4	0	6	-6	1	5	-4
Use Employ. Org	5	10	3	7	6	5	1	1	0	1	-1	1	2	-1
Use Aff.Act.Off	7	15	5	10	10	4	6	2	0	4	-4	0	2	-2
File Complaint	7	21	6	15	10	3	7	2	0	3	-3	0	2	-2
Public Protest	2	21	0	21	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legal Action	4	21	3	18	2	1	1	0	0	1	-1	0	1	-1
EFFECTED WORK	11	10	10	0	14	11	3	4	0	4	-4	2	8	-6
Cut back on Work	6	5	6	-1	3	8	-5	3	0	3	-3	2	5	-3
Apply for Transf	3	5	1	4	6	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	-3
Resignation*	8	10	7	3	14	5	9	2	0	2	-2	2	4	-2
ANY ACT./CONSID.	45	65	51	14	36	38	-2	42	66	50	16	31	34	-3

*Took steps to leave college

Perhaps unfortunately in a way, the favorite tactic for dealing with a bad racial experience proved to be no tactic at all -- 58 percent of our victims said through an absence of checkmarks that they did absolutely nothing in response. This might very well indicate an unhealthy passivity, taking such knocks

lying down, as it were. If this is truly the case, then well over half of employee victims are experiencing no healing, only growing, repressed resentment which could eventually feed back into campus racial tensions.

On the other had, the 58 percent do-nothing figure might also be taken as evidence of a high level of indifference to, and involvement in, campus life. This explanation, however, would seem better to fit student victim passivity (racial victims among the student sample also tended to nonresponse). After all, students make only a short-term commitment to the institution and are in the main part-timers spending little time on campus compared with most employees. A previously unreported finding from this study lends support here:

"PGCC's problems don't effect me much;
I'm not much involved with campus life"

	Percent		
	DISAGR	NEUTRAL	AGREE
Students	19	20	60
Faculty	38	24	39
Staff	35	29	36

Among the 42 percent non-passive victims, the preferred form of actual response seemed to be some kind of talk. Other avenues of healing, redress or revenge were almost unchosen in comparison. Nearly two-fifths (36 percent) sought comfort, consolation, advice or support in conversation with a friend, coworker or superior. Attempting to talk through a bias incident with its instigator was also a fairly popular reaction, one adopted by over a fifth (21 percent) of all victims.

This raises the question of why other readily available, more aggressive options were rarely actually exercised by employee victims. None of our survey's respondents chose any of the open and waiting formal channels for a redress of grievances -- the CSO grievance committee, the College Affirmative Action Office, civil action, public protest, etc. And only a handful chose termination of a relationship or taking steps to leave PGCC employ or putting in for inter-office transfer or outright personal retaliation by returning the abuse verbally or physically.

Whatever the answer, maybe gratitude is called for that few have taken these dramatic steps. Such drastic responses have the potential to raise the level of campus racial conflict. Still, one might have hoped that at least some of the formal grievance procedures would have been more frequently employed by the victims of racial bias. While one would wish to avoid conflict escalation, equally one would like to see more conflict resolution. The formal channels for venting resentments and restoring equity were put in place just for these reasons.

Not that some significant numbers of employee victims never contemplated such actions. The left side portion of the last table not yet discussed includes victims who only thought about taking certain steps in response to a bias experience along with those who actually followed through. It reveals that, considered only or actually done, ending relationships (11 percent), verbal or physical retaliation (13 percent), allowing work to be effected (11 percent) and formal redress (12 percent) had some real appeal after all.

In other words, the potential is there for a far more vigorous reaction to felt discrimination than has yet actually to appear. And this seems to be particularly true for the nonwhite employee victims of bias. Over a quarter (26 percent), for example, told us that they at least considered taking some type of formal action against the individual discriminator or against the employing institution.

Conclusion

How are we doing during this period of rising racial tensions nationally and continuing racial change in the composition of our student body? Have the increasingly diverse elements of our College community been learning how to get along with one another? The answers are both well and poorly and yes and no, according to the data from our student/faculty/staff survey of racial attitudes and perceptions of PGCC's current racial climate.

The College community has managed to retain its essential idealism, good will and capacity to care. Racial tensions, while they certainly exist at PGCC, do not seem over the last few years to have been growing at any significant rate and have not reached anything near the level necessary to cause a collapse of community morale and trust, widespread racial alienation and confrontation, or the wholesale desertion of important elements. By and large, we PGCCers still basically like one another, think the atmosphere on campus is at least "OK," and continue to find studying and working at the College a rewarding experience.

On the other hand, we have detected a level of racial tension sufficient for us to recommend that the College community be on its guard against a not-so-rosy future if certain problems which are now mere irritations are to be prevented from growing into full pathologies by deliberate, well-considered prophylactic measures. For example, an educational campaign publicizing many of the more important findings of this and the previous race climate study concerning inter-group misunderstandings, frictions and grievances -- just making the objective facts available to all parties -- might go far to remove one major obstacle to racial peace -- ignorance of the "other" -- and to re-sensitize us all to one another's feelings and needs and how our own behaviors have been affecting others.

Toward this end, we would like to conclude by highlighting what we consider to be the principle problems identified by our employee racial climate research:

- PGCC employees, in agreement with the College's student body, tend to see the general racial climate on campus as satisfactory; this is true regardless of respondent racial background, although nonwhites as a group do show somewhat less certainty in this regard.

- But when the focus is on within-employee force racial climate, and particularly when indirect opinion measures are used, perceptions tend to become quite racially polarized, with white employees registering in general high levels of satisfaction and nonwhite employees displaying almost negative perceptions, a significant minority of them harboring real grievances against their white coworkers and the institution.

- Nonwhite faculty come closest to unhappiness of the four job/race groups within the employee force; white faculty come closest to complacency.

- Complaints of discrimination against nonwhite employees center especially on biased treatment on the job (35 percent); around 20 percent of nonwhite employees also report subtle interpersonal discrimination -- being treated condescendingly.

- White employees tend more to complain of racially slighting jokes made by nonwhite coworkers (21 percent) and, if they are teachers, of ill-treatment by nonwhite students (20 percent).

• Two potentially explosive race-related issues for PGCC employees are job quotas by race and multiculturalizing the curriculum. Although neither white nor nonwhite employees now approve of implementing a hiring quota system at PGCC, nonwhites were far more likely to endorse in principle the notion of quotas as an important civil rights tool. And while white faculty told us of their readiness to work multicultural ideas and values into their courses, only a small proportion thought that U.S. education as it stood was overly Eurocentric.

• There is a great gap between the perceptions of white faculty and nonwhite students over how well they get along, teachers giving a B+ to the quality of their interrelationship, students awarding only a C. Furthermore, nonwhite student complaints of discrimination tend disproportionately to be about racial bias in the classroom. (In contrast, white students seem to be most concerned about poor treatment by nonwhite students.)

Karl Boughan

Research and Planning Analyst

A*P*P*E*N*D*I*X

Review of Sample Characteristics

The table below comprehensively depicts the complex nature of the total PGCC racial climate survey sample. Four subsamples of potential student respondents were randomly generated from PGCC Spring 1992 credit course lists: 5,000 nonwhites, 1,000 whites, 500 part-timers (any race), 500 developmental course enrollees (any race). To these, a fifth subsample was added consisting of **all** full-time or part-time workers (faculty and staff) on the current College employee register (N=1,763). The table shows the resulting questionnaire-returned sample numbers by College population categories. In addition, the table uses the term "effective" sample to denote questionnaire-returned respondents not dropped because of failure to answer to the critical racial background item. Finally, it shows how faculty/staff respondent numbers were altered by statistical reweighting to bring proportions back in line with known employee population parameters, and the effects of entire sample reweighting to adjust for proportional differences among subsamples.

PGCC Racial Climate Study Sampling Scheme

SAMPLE/ SUBSAMPLE	ACTUAL POP. %	ACTUAL POP. #	UNWT'D SUB %	UNWT'D SUB #	WT'D SUBSMP %	WT'D SUBSMP #	WT'D WHOLE %	WT'D WHOLE #
STUDENTS	100	(12,017)	--	(1,198)	---	---	--	---
Effective ..	--	---	100	(1,156)	---	---	88	(11,975)
* NONWHITES	62	(7,435)	65	(779)	---	---	54	(7,409)
* WHITES ...	38	(4,582)	35	(429)	---	---	33	(4,566)
[Race N/A]	--	---	[4]	[(42)]	---	---	--	---
EMPLOYEES	100	(1,763)	--	(552)	--	(592)	--	---
Effective ..	--	---	100	(499)	100	(539)	12	(1,710)
*FACULTY ..	44	(781)	45	(230)	46	(249)	6	(758)
** Nonwhites	10	(176)	7	(37)	9	(48)	1	(171)
** Whites ..	34	(605)	38	(193)	37	(201)	4	(587)
* STAFF	56	(982)	55	(269)	54	(290)	7	(952)
** Nonwhites	25	(435)	18	(91)	23	(125)	3	(422)
** Whites ..	31	(547)	36	(178)	31	(165)	4	(531)
[Race N/A]	--	---	[10]	[(53)]	[9]	[(53)]	--	---
TOTAL	100	(13,780)	--	---	--	---	100	(13,685)

NOTE: Effective Sample = Sample - Race N/A

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRINCE GEORGE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Prince George's Community College

Campus Climate Survey, Spring 1992

©1992

For each of the following questions, please circle the number indicating your response. Circle "9" if you don't know or cannot answer an item. All responses are confidential.

A. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about American society?

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1. On the whole, America is still a land of fairness and opportunity for all.	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. American education is based too much on European history and values.	5	4	3	2	1	9
3. Anyone who works hard and has skills can get ahead, regardless of background.	5	4	3	2	1	9
4. People of the same culture should stick together and work for their group's goals.	5	4	3	2	1	9
5. Qualified minority applicants should be given the advantage in job hiring.	5	4	3	2	1	9
6. America should take care of its own people before it lets in any more immigrants.	5	4	3	2	1	9
7. Relations among U.S. racial and ethnic groups are getting much worse.	5	4	3	2	1	9

B. For the following groups at PGCC, what is your best guess as to the percent of minority (non-white) people?

	Less than 20%	20-39	40-59	60-79	Over 80%	Don't Know
1. Students	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. Faculty	5	4	3	2	1	9
3. Administrators	5	4	3	2	1	9
4. Counselors/Advisors	5	4	3	2	1	9
5. Campus Police	5	4	3	2	1	9
6. Other PGCC Employees	5	4	3	2	1	9

C. For the same groups, how do you think that percentage has been changing?

	Increasing Fast	Slowly	Staying Same	Decreasing Slowly	Fast	Don't Know
1. Students	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. Faculty	5	4	3	2	1	9
3. Administrators	5	4	3	2	1	9
4. Counselors/Advisors	5	4	3	2	1	9
5. Campus Police	5	4	3	2	1	9
6. Other PGCC Employees	5	4	3	2	1	9

D. How would you describe current race and ethnic group relations at PGCC?

	Very Good	Good	OK	Poor	Very Poor	Don't Know
1. within the College overall	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. between white and minority students	5	4	3	2	1	9
3. among different minority student groups (African-Americans, Hispanics, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1	9
4. between white faculty & minority students	5	4	3	2	1	9
5. between minority faculty & white students	5	4	3	2	1	9
6. within the College faculty and staff	5	4	3	2	1	9

E. From what you know or have heard, how would you describe overall race relations at PGCC?

	Much Better		About the Same		Much Worse	Don't Know
1. compared to 2 years ago	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. compared with other colleges and universities	5	4	3	2	1	9

F. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning PGCC? (Circle number. Use "9" for "Don't Know".)

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1. Our mix of different cultures and view-points is one of PGCC's great strengths.	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. A real problem here is how whites put down non-whites in little ways – in talk and looks	5	4	3	2	1	9
3. The College's record on creating policies fair to all groups is excellent.	5	4	3	2	1	9
4. Everyone breaks up into racial or ethnic groups which never talk to each other.	5	4	3	2	1	9
5. People tend to make too much of racial tensions on campus.	5	4	3	2	1	9
6. At PGCC, minorities are just as biased against whites as whites are against them.	5	4	3	2	1	9
7. Many administators, teachers and students work hard to make PGCC a good place to be for everyone.	5	4	3	2	1	9
8. I sometimes fear that most whites will leave PGCC.	5	4	3	2	1	9

G. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about *you personally*?

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1. I find being part of a college community with so many different groups valuable.	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. The racial climate at PGCC makes me feel uncomfortable.	5	4	3	2	1	9
3. PGCC's problems don't affect me much; I'm not much involved with campus life.	5	4	3	2	1	9
4. I often get angry or upset over what goes on here racially.	5	4	3	2	1	9
5. I'm proud of PGCC which tries hard to provide a good education to everybody.	5	4	3	2	1	9
6. I have to admit I've occasionally said or done something related to race which made someone at PGCC angry or unhappy.	5	4	3	2	1	9

	Very Good	Good	O.K.	Poor	Very Poor	Don't Know
H. How good a place to work has PGCC been in helping you reach your career goals?	5	4	3	2	.1	9

I. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about working at PGCC?

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1. Overall, PGCC is a very friendly, caring place to work.	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. Overall, the College's record on hiring minority employees is excellent.	5	4	3	2	1	9
3. Overall, the College's record on promoting and giving minority employees positions of responsibility is excellent.	5	4	3	2	1	9
4. My workmates are O.K., but racial tensions with students bother me a lot.	5	4	3	2	1	9
5. Rules aside, minority employees aren't given full respect in many little ways.	5	4	3	2	1	9
6. At PGCC, it's qualifications, not politics, that counts at hiring and promotion time.	5	4	3	2	1	9
7. There's more ill feeling among employees over race than is openly admitted.	5	4	3	2	1	9
8. Job quotas are the only real way to get true racial balance in PGCC's workforce.	5	4	3	2	1	9
9. Because of the racial climate here, I've been seriously thinking of leaving my job.	5	4	3	2	1	9
10. Most College employees try hard to make PGCC a real multi-cultural family.	5	4	3	2	1	9

J. Mainly because of your racial or ethnic background:

a. have any of these things ever happened to *you personally* as a PGCC employee?
b. have you ever witnessed or been told of these things happening to *other PGCC employees*? (Circle all that apply.)

	Happened to You	Saw/Heard About
1. heard a racially insulting joke told at work	2	1
2. insulted by racial remark or slur by a workmate	2	1
3. insulted by racial remark or slur by supervisor	2	1

	Happened to You	Saw/Heard About
4. treated as a lesser person by workmate	2	1
5. treated as a lesser person by supervisor	2	1
6. given assignment no one wants/beneath my ability	2	1
7. ignored or not given respect in a work meeting	2	1
8. socially excluded from informal group of workers	2	1
9. not given award/public recognition for good work	2	1
10. not given deserved promotion or improved job	2	1
11. got into genuine fight/feud over race at work	2	1
12. put down, insulted or harassed by a student	2	1

K. ***Skip if a racial incident at PGCC has never happened to you.*** **Have you ever done or tried to do any of the following things after a racial incident?**

	Actually Did	Only Considered	Never Occurred To Me
1. Tried talking it over/working things out with the person responsible	2	1	0
2. Lashed back with equal insults and abuse	2	1	0
3. Lashed back physically/got into a fight	2	1	0
4. Talked with/sought comfort from an off-campus friend or advisor	2	1	0
5. Talked with/sought advice, support from one or more fellow employees	2	1	0
6. Talked matter over informally with supervisor, administrator/other PGCC official	2	1	0
7. Consulted with CSO/ASO/Faculty Senate	2	1	0
8. Consulted with Affirmative Action Officer	2	1	0
9. Filed a formal complaint with the College administration or other authority	2	1	0
10. Organized a public protest/contacted the newspapers	2	1	0
11. Saw a lawyer/took legal action	2	1	0
12. Ended a friendship/withdrew from a group	2	1	0
13. Dropped a non-work campus activity	2	1	0
14. Limited your effort on the job afterwards	2	1	0
15. Put in to transfer to another PGCC job	2	1	0
16. Took steps to leave PGCC	2	1	0

L. ***(For Faculty Only)*** **Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about working at PGCC? (Circle number. Use "9" for "Don't Know".)**

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1. I do a lot of consulting and just talking with students outside of class.	5	4	3	2	1	9
2. I get angry and depressed over how few students today are prepared for college.	5	4	3	2	1	9
3. Having students from many different backgrounds makes teaching more rewarding.	5	4	3	2	1	9
4. I tend to expect less of disadvantaged minority students until I get to know them.	5	4	3	2	1	9
5. I feel sure I can work the multicultural approach into my teaching.	5	4	3	2	1	9
6. Racial tensions in my classroom are making my teaching job increasingly difficult.	5	4	3	2	1	9
7. The position of minority faculty is more difficult than that of white teachers.	5	4	3	2	1	9
8. I admit I'm more comfortable teaching students from my own cultural background.	5	4	3	2	1	9

For statistical purposes we need some background data on our respondents. None of the answers you give here will or can be used to identify you as an individual. (Circle number unless told otherwise)

M. Which is your age group?

1. Under 20
2. 20 - 24
3. 25 - 34
4. 35 - 44
5. 45 - 59
6. 60 or older

N. What is your gender?

1. Female
2. Male

O. How do you classify yourself in terms of race/ethnicity?

1. Native American
2. African-American/Black
3. Asian or Pacific Islander
4. Hispanic/Latino/Latin American
5. White

P. What is the highest degree you have earned?

1. Less than H.S. diploma
2. High School diploma/G.E.D.
3. Certificate
4. A.A. degree
5. Bachelor's degree
6. Master's degree
7. Doctoral degree

Q. What is your *current main* PGCC job category?

1. Administrator
2. Full-Time Classified Staff
3. Part-Time Classified Staff
4. Full-Time Faculty
5. Adjunct Faculty

R. How many years have you been employed at PGCC? _____

Thank you for participating in this campus-wide survey. Your response is important! Please use the pre-addressed envelope to return the survey by campus mail.

Institutional Research and Analysis
Kent Hall 231